



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/751,022

01/02/2004

Eric A. Portman

10022/325

3692

33391 7590 04/02/2008
ACCENTURE INDY 33391
BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
ONE INDIANA SQUARE, SUITE 1600
INDIANAPOLIS, IN 46204

EXAMINER

WIN, AUNG T

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2617

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

04/02/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/751,022	Applicant(s) PORTMAN ET AL.	
	Examiner AUNG T. WIN	Art Unit 2617	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 March 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-79 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-35,37,49,60 and 66 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 36,38-48,50-59,61-65 and 67-79 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 36-66 filed on 03/03/2008 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 03/03/2008 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims 36, 48, 58, 59, 38, 50, 61, 44, 45, 47, 56, 65, 67-70 & 73, 39, 43, 46, 51, 54, 62, 63 & 71, 75, 77-79 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goldfinger et al (US006449344B1) in view of Tsutsumi et al. (US20030078034A1), further in view of Berkely et al. (US006546005B1) and Austin-Lane et al. (US20040059790A1).

1.1 Regarding Claim 36, Goldfinger discloses a method of providing information assistance to a wireless terminal [wireless communication terminal 12: Figure 2], comprising the steps of:

receiving, from a wireless terminal [wireless terminal 12 of requesting user 18: Column 6], a contact information request with an information assistance application located on an information assistance server [information assistance server 20: Column 6], wherein the contact information request is a request for an information record associated with a subscriber terminal [a request for location information or other information relating to wireless terminal 12 of user 34: Column 6] that is other than the wireless terminal;

generating and transmitting an authorization request to request permission from the subscriber terminal to provide the information record of the subscriber terminal to the wireless terminal [transmitting request for authorization to wireless terminal 12 of user 34: Column 6]; and

receiving a reply from the subscriber terminal indicative of whether or not the requested information record is permitted to be provided to the wireless terminal [user 34 provides authorization information to information assistance server 20: Column 6]; and

generating a response for transmittal to the wireless terminal only when the reply is indicative of permission to proceed with provision of the requested information record to the wireless terminal [transmitting to the wireless terminal 12 of user 18 requested information authorized by user 34: Column 6].

Goldfinger does not explicitly teach identifying information step. Tsutsumi discloses the attribute adding program to indicate only information that is identified by a user of wireless communication terminal as permissible to share with other wireless terminal [0038, 0039 & 0047].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention of made to modify Goldfinger's information providing system and method to install attribute adding program as taught by Tsutsumi to identify only information by a user of wireless communication terminal as permissible to share with other wireless terminal to process as claimed. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time

of invention of made would have been motivated to provide improved authorizing information method.

Modified system and method as stated above does not explicitly teach a contact preference. Berkley disclose user contact information database comprising user's contact preference [Figure 2] [Ability to reach a user is subject to the user's preference: Column 8, Line 1-16] [Preferred communication option: Column 11, Line 55-Column 12, Line 35].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention of made to further modify the method to process the call based on subscriber contact preference as taught by Berkley. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention of made to do this to process the calls efficiently and appropriately [Column 4, Line 25-30]. One of ordinary skill in the art would also realize that the method as modified would teach claimed identifying the requestor steps and authorization steps as claimed because the information providing method as modified above teaches a first user to request information of second user stored in centralized database upon authorization of second user wherein authorization is requested based on second user contact preference.

The method as modified above does not explicitly teach generating and providing requested information according to requestor format preferences as claimed. Austin-Lane et al. teaches generating and providing requested information to requestor based on format preferences of the requestor [requester receive requested information based on requestor delivery preference: 0035] [requested information: 0003] [delivery

preference includes both text-based response (i.e., instant message) **and**/or voice-based response (i.e., audio or tactile alarm): 0035]

Therefore, it would have been obvious to further modify the information providing method as taught by Austin-Lane et al. to provide information based on requestor format preference as claimed. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention of made to do this provide improved information service according to service user's convenience.

1.2 Claims 48 & 58 are rejected for the same reason as stated above in Claim 1 rejection because claimed executed steps are substantially close to claim 1. At the time of invention of made, it is obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that modified system would comprises computer readable medium storing claimed computer program executed by processor of wireless computing terminals in order to execute the claimed steps accordingly.

1.3 Claims 59 are the system claim rejected for the same reason as rejections stated above because executed steps by claimed means substantially close to the corresponding steps of Claim 1. It is obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that modified system and method teaches claimed information assistance application incorporated in the information assistance server in order to process as claimed.

1.4 Claims 38, 50 & 61 are rejected for the same reason as Claim 1 rejection stated above. Regarding Claims 37, 3, 14, 15, 26 & 27, modified system and method teach generating step for providing authorized private information of the subscriber terminal [See Claim 1 rejection].

1.5 Claims 44, 45, 47, 56, 65 are rejected for the same reasons as rejections stated above. Modified system and method teaches determining contact preference based on the contact preference information database [See Claim 36 rejections].

1.6 Claims 67-70 & 73 are rejected for the same reason as stated above in Claims 36 and 59. It is obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that the system and method as modified with the teaching of Tsutsumi's identification software program would teach as claimed in Claims 67-70 & 73.

1.7 Claims 39, 43, 46, 51, 54, 62, 63 & 71 are rejected for the same reason as stated above. Austin-Lane et al. teaches generating and providing requested information to requestor based on format preferences of the requestor [requester receive requested information based on requestor delivery preference: 0035] [requested information: 0003] [delivery preference includes both text-based response (i.e., instant message) **and/or** voice-based response (i.e., audio or tactile alarm): 0035]. Therefore, modified method and system teaches as claimed in Claims 39, 43, 46, 51, 54, 62, 63 & 71.

1.8 Claim 75 & 77 are rejected for the same reason as stated above in Claim 36 rejection. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that the method and system as modified would teach the feature as claimed in claims 75 & 77 because the modified method teaches requesting and response authorization mechanism (i.e., the user is configured to selectively reply in response to received authorization request to share information selectively by indicating what information to share or not to share information: see claim 36 rejection) to determine authorization access requested information of the subscriber terminal.

1.9 Claims 78 & 79 are rejected for the same reason as stated above in Claims 36 & 39 rejection because claimed method substantially close to corresponding method of Claims 78 & 79.

2. Claim 40 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goldfinger et al (US006449344B1) in view of Tsutsumi et al. (US20030078034A1), further in view of Berkely et al. (US006546005B1), Austin-Lane et al. (US20040059790A1) and Futagami et al. (US006754665B1).

2.1 Regarding Claim 40, the system and method as modified above teaches selecting information from a group of information, however does not explicitly disclose all information record items as claimed although user information authorized to be provided is address of the user terminal and other information associated with user and

other user personal information [see information disclosed in Goldfinger and Tsutsumi].

Futagami teaches sharing information stored in personal information database [Abstract]. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention of made to modify the system and method as taught by Futagami to register personal information as claimed. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention of made would have been motivated to do this to share registered personal information stored in the network.

3. Claim 41, 52, 55, 57 & 64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goldfinger et al (US006449344B1) in view of Tsutsumi et al. (US20030078034A1), further in view of Berkely et al. (US006546005B1), Austin-Lane et al. (US20040059790A1) and Elsey (US20020055351A1).

3.1 The modified method and system does not explicitly disclose voice response unit however such component is expected in information providing system. Elsey disclose voice response unit to process information assistance calls [Elsey: Paragraph 0051 & 0053]. At the time of invention of made, it is obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that information assistance system teaches determining the identify of the user based on voice recognition module and voice print analysis because modified information assistance method is based on identify of the requesting wireless terminal. Moreover, Interactive Voice Response system (IVR) system for identification users based on voice print analysis and voice recognition application is well known to skilled in the art the at

the time of invention of made. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention of made to further modify the system with voice response unit as taught by Elsey to modify as claimed. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention of made would have been motivated to do this to provide efficient call processing. It should be noted that concept and advantages of integrating voice response module in communications sytem does not constitute the patentably distinct limitation from modified method and system.

4. Claim 42 & 53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goldfinger et al (US006449344B1) in view of Tsutsumi et al. (US20030078034A1), further in view of Berkely et al. (US006546005B1), and Austin-Lane et al. (US20040059790A1) and Sugiyama et al (US006345245B1).

4.1 Regarding Claims 42 &53, modified system and method teaches processing contact information request but does not explicitly disclose processing with Natural Language Processing module. Sugiyama teaches such claimed feature lacks in modified system [Background and Summary] for translating the transmitted information.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention of made to utilize natural language processing system as claimed to process contact information request as claimed. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention of made to do this to provide improved information assistance system to process the request effectively [Sugiyama: Background].

5. Claim 72 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goldfinger et al (US006449344B1) in view of Tsutsumi et al. (US20030078034A1), further in view of Berkely et al. (US006546005B1), and Austin-Lane et al. (US20040059790A1) and Chaddha et al. (US20050020250A1).

5.1 Regarding Claim 72, modified method and system as stated above does not explicitly teach as claimed in Claim 72. Chaddha teaches transmitting information to the communication terminal that is compatible with the wireless terminal [0047]. It should be noted that such claimed feature is well known to one skill in the art at the time of invention of made. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention of made to further modify the method as claimed as taught by Chaddha. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention of made would have been motivated to do this to make improvement in information transmission system according to user's device communications capability.

6. Claims 74 & 76 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goldfinger et al (US006449344B1) in view of Tsutsumi et al. (US20030078034A1), further in view of Berkely et al. (US006546005B1), Austin-Lane et al. (US20040059790A1) and Holvery et al. (US20040054935 A1).

6.1 Regarding Claims 74, the method and system as modified does not explicitly teach authentication requesting users before providing requested information as cited in claim 74. Holvery teaches authentication requesting users and verifying the requestor that requestor is authorized to make the contact information request [0022 & 0031]. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention of made to further modify the method as claimed as taught by Holvery authentication and verification method. One of ordinary skill in the art at the of invention of made to do this to enhance information providing service with high security.

6.2 Claim 76 is rejected for the same reason as stated above in Claim 74 rejection because voice recognition system as taught in Holvery would teach the claimed feature as claimed in order to determine the meaning of user spoken words because voice recognition module implemented with speaker dependent and/or speaker independent technology to process the user voice to identify the meanings of intent of the words are well known to one of ordinary skills in the speech processing art at the time of invention of made to utilize in information providing service system.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Aung T. Win whose telephone number is (571) 272-7549. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 AM - 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Duc Nguyen can be reached on (571) 272-7503. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Aung T Win/

Examiner, Art Unit 2617

March 27, 2008

/Duc Nguyen/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2617

Application/Control Number: 10/751,022
Art Unit: 2617

Page 14